

# Inspector General

## United States

## Department *of* Defense



Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service  
Members Generally Adequate; However,  
the Navy Needed Improvement

<b>Report Documentation Page</b>			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.				
1. REPORT DATE <b>18 JUL 2012</b>	2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2012 to 00-00-2012</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service Members Generally Adequate; However, the Navy Needed Improvement</b>			5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
			5b. GRANT NUMBER	
			5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)			5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
			5e. TASK NUMBER	
			5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Department of Defense Office of Inspector General, 4800 Mark Center Drive, Alexandria, VA, 22350-1500</b>			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
			11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>				
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
14. ABSTRACT				
15. SUBJECT TERMS				
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>21</b>
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>		

## **Additional Copies**

To obtain additional copies of this report, visit the Web site of the Department of Defense Inspector General at <http://www.dodig.mil/audit/reports> or contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or fax (571) 372-7469.

## **Suggestions for Audits**

To suggest or request audits, contact the Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing by phone (703) 604-9142 (DSN 664-9142), by fax (571) 372-7469, or by mail:

Department of Defense Office of Inspector General  
Office of the Deputy Inspector General for Auditing  
ATTN: Audit Suggestions/13F25-04  
4800 Mark Center Drive  
Alexandria, VA 22350-1500



## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

AFPC	Air Force Personnel Center
ASN(M&RA)	Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
DCAPES	Deliberate and Crisis Action Planning and Execution Segments
DIMHRS	Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System
DMDC	Defense Manpower and Data Center
DTAS	Deployed Theater Accountability System
ITEMPO	Individual Personnel Tempo
PEO-EIS	Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems
PERSCO	Personnel Support for Contingency Operations
SIPRNET	Secure Internet Protocol Router Network
SPA	Secure Personnel Accountability
WHS	Washington Headquarters Service



**INSPECTOR GENERAL**  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
4800 MARK CENTER DRIVE  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22350-1500

July 18, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (HEALTH AFFAIRS)

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE  
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)  
NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL  
AUDITOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SUBJECT: Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service Members Generally Adequate;  
However, the Navy Needed Improvement  
(Report No. DODIG-2012-112)

We are providing this report for your information and use. We performed the audit in response to a verbal request from senior officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs). We considered management comments on a draft of this report when preparing the final report. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) comments and a memorandum from the Secretary of Navy conformed to the requirements of DoD Directive 7650.3 and left no unresolved issues. Therefore, we do not require any additional comments.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the staff. Please direct questions to me at (703) 604-8935.

*Alice F. Carey*  
Alice F. Carey  
Assistant Inspector General  
Readiness, Operations, and Support





# Results in Brief: Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service Members Generally Adequate; However, the Navy Needed Improvement

---

## What We Did

This audit was the result of a verbal request from senior officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs). Our overall objective was to assess DoD's effectiveness in reporting the daily location of deployed Service members for use in health surveillance. Specifically, we evaluated the status of the Military Departments' implementation of daily Service member location reporting to Defense Manpower and Data Center.

## What We Found

The Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps reported the daily location of deployed Service members; however, the Navy did not report the required deployment information. This occurred because the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) did not task the appropriate Navy commands to establish clear roles and responsibilities for implementing the daily location reporting requirements of DoD Instruction 6490.03, "Deployment Health," August 11, 2006. As a result, the Defense Manpower Data Center did not have comprehensive DoD daily Service member deployment records available for users to monitor, assess, and control or reduce health risks from Service member exposures to occupational and environmental hazards.

## What We Recommend

We recommend that the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) task the appropriate commands to establish roles and responsibilities for implementing daily location reporting for deployed Service members required by DoD Instruction 6490.03, "Deployment Health," August 11, 2006.

## Management Comments and Our Response

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) agreed with the recommendation. We consider the comments responsive. Please see the recommendation table on the back of this page.

## Recommendation Table

Management	Recommendation Requiring Comment
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)	None

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b>	1
Objectives	1
Background	1
Review of Internal Controls	2
<b>Finding. Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps Reported Location Data, but the Navy Did Not</b>	3
Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps Implemented Daily Location Reporting	3
Navy Did Not Report Daily Location Data	5
Appropriate Navy Commands Not Tasked	5
Lack of Complete Data Hinders the Ability to Monitor Potential Hazardous Exposures	6
Recommendation, Management Comments, and Our Response	7
<b>Appendices</b>	
A. Scope and Methodology	8
Use of Computer-Processed Data	8
Prior Coverage	8
B. Service Compliance With Required Reporting Data Elements	10
<b>Management Comments</b>	
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)	11



# Introduction

## Objectives

Our overall objective was to assess DoD's effectiveness in reporting the daily location of deployed Service members for use in health surveillance. Specifically, we evaluated the status of the Military Departments' implementation of daily Service member location reporting to the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC). This audit was the result of a verbal request from senior officials in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs). See Appendix A for a discussion of our scope and methodology.

## Background

DoD Instruction 6490.03, "Deployment Health," (DoD Instruction) August 11, 2006, requires the Military Departments to plan, program, and implement a system to ensure daily location recording for all deployed personnel assigned, attached, on temporary duty, or temporary additional duty to deployed units. The DoD Instruction required the Services to report the daily location information electronically to DMDC at least weekly. Also, the DoD Instruction required DoD to implement a system to ensure daily location reporting within 3 years of its issuance date. The office of primary responsibility for the DoD Instruction is the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the action office is the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs). The DoD Instruction was certified current on September 30, 2011. Appendix B includes a list of the required reporting data elements.

Deployed Service members are potentially subject to occupational and environmental hazards that can include exposure to harmful levels of environmental contaminants, such as industrial toxic chemicals, chemical and biological warfare agents, or radiological and nuclear contaminants. These hazards may include contamination from the past use of a site, battle damage, stored stockpiles, military use of hazardous materials, or from other sources. Harmful levels include high-level exposures that result in immediate health effects and low-level exposures that could result in delayed or long-term health effects.

Collecting deployment information will allow the Military Health System to identify populations at risk for occupational and environmental exposures that may need medical follow-up. Improving timeliness of treatment will have a positive effect on readiness and long-term wounded warrior care.

## **Review of Internal Controls**

DoD Instruction 5010.40, “Managers’ Internal Control Program (MICP) Procedures,” July 29, 2010, requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of internal controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the effectiveness of the controls. We identified an internal control weakness for the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) (ASN[M&RA]). Specifically, the Navy did not establish roles and responsibilities for implementing the DoD Instruction that required reporting daily location of deployed Service members. We will provide a copy of the report to the senior official responsible for internal controls at ASN(M&RA).

# **Finding. Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps Reported Location Data, but the Navy Did Not**

The Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps reported the daily location of deployed Service members; however, the Navy did not report the required deployment information. This occurred because the Office of the ASN(M&RA) did not task the appropriate Navy commands to establish roles and responsibilities for implementing the DoD Instruction that required reporting daily deployment information. As a result, DMDC did not have comprehensive DoD daily Service member deployment records. Users require comprehensive records to monitor, assess, and control or reduce health risks from Service member exposures to occupational and environmental hazards.

## **Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps Implemented Daily Location Reporting**

The Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps extracted daily location of deployed Service member data from Service specific systems and reported this information electronically to DMDC, as required by the DoD Instruction. See Appendix B for details on Service compliance with required reporting data elements.

### ***Army Reported Using the Deployed Theater Accountability System***

The Army used the Deployed Theater Accountability System (DTAS), a worldwide real-time in theater personnel accountability system, to capture and report weekly the data elements required by the DoD Instruction. The Army Human Resource Command executed the reporting requirement through a System Interface Agreement with the Army Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO-EIS). Army PEO-EIS personnel extracted deployed Service member location data from DTAS and transferred the file to DMDC over the Secure Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET). According to Army PEO-EIS personnel, the Army relied on DTAS to track the physical location of assigned and attached active duty Service members, including those supporting contingency operations since 2004. Army personnel provided documentation that showed DTAS operates in remote locations, maintains personnel location information while disconnected from the network, synchronizes and updates location information once network connections are re-established, and interfaces with other DoD systems by extracting and providing location information on a daily basis. Unit level mobile stations were the main source used to collect Service member information, such as name, social security number, duty status, unit affiliation, and location coordinates.

Army PEO-EIS personnel provided us with program scripts used to extract data weekly and twice monthly in support of the Service member location information reported to

DMDC. Army PEO-EIS personnel extracted data consisting of Service member transitions that occurred during the week and transferred the extract to the DMDC server each Friday. Additionally, Army PEO-EIS personnel provided DMDC a comprehensive history of personnel deployment information on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of each month. We validated that the Army included data elements required by the DoD Instruction.

### ***Air Force Reported Using the Deliberate and Crisis Action Planning and Execution Segments System***

The Air Force reported daily location information of deployed Service members using the Deliberate and Crisis Action Planning and Execution Segments (DCAPES) system. DCAPES includes operation plan requirements and monitoring resource capabilities. DCAPES has the capability to report and query information on deployed personnel and their deployment histories, to include automatic updating of Service member duty status. The primary users of DCAPES are at the base level and each command provides personnel who access the system through the SIPRNET.

The Air Force Personnel Support for Contingency Operations (PERSCO) teams accounted for transient forces that spent at least one night at a location. PERSCO teams assisted the deployed commander in achieving accountability of deployed forces by tracking and updating personnel reports. PERSCO teams identified force status changes for arrivals, departures to home station and forward deployments, temporary duty status changes, and strength figures. Daily transaction registers produced within DCAPES showed changes for the PERSCO teams and home stations.

According to Air Force Personnel Center (AFPC) personnel, in 2003, AFPC and DMDC entered into an agreement, “Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) & Interface Requirements Agreement Between the Air Force DCAPES system and Department of Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) Deployment File,” to govern the transfer of data between the two activities. The agreement established the arrangement between the Air Force and DMDC to meet the minimum reporting requirements in the DoD Instruction.

AFPC personnel extracted data from DCAPES to create two files of deployed Service members. One file contained all Service members currently deployed, and one file contained a complete history of all Service members deployed. AFPC personnel produced both files weekly and transferred the files to the DMDC server over the SIPRNET. We validated that AFPC personnel reported all data elements required by the DoD Instruction.

### ***Marine Corps Reported Using the Secure Personnel Accountability System***

The Marine Corps reported daily location information of deployed Service members using the Secure Personnel Accountability (SPA) system. The SPA system is the official system of records for deployed Marines and enables Marine Corps operational commanders to account for deployed operational forces worldwide. In 2004, the Marine

Corps relied on the Army DTAS for Marine location reporting during operational deployments. In 2007, the Marine Corps awarded a contract for SPA development, and in 2009, the II Marine Expeditionary Force operating in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility was the first group of deployed Marines to deploy SPA. The Marine Corps transitioned from DTAS to SPA with Marine Corps Administrative Message 007/11, “Mandating the Corps-Wide Use of Secure Personnel Accountability (SPA) System for Operational Deployment,” January 4, 2011, that stated all U.S. Marine Corps forces deployed for any contingency or combat operation will use SPA to account for their personnel.

Personnel at U.S. Marine Corps, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, explained that SPA provided real-time accountability of deployed Service members and allowed users to document and store daily individual location data. SPA included individual Marine personnel data, such as name, rank, Military Occupational Specialty, and gender. Also, the SPA included deployment status, unit assignment, and physical location data. SPA retained information from the time a Marine first deployed until separation from the Marine Corps. Unit personnel at deployment locations entered location information to secure terminals and forwarded daily location information, through the SIPRNET, to the Marine Corps Hosting Center in Quantico, Virginia. Then, the Hosting Center transmitted the location information over the SIPRNET to DMDC weekly. Manpower and Reserve Affairs personnel at Quantico, Virginia, provided us access to SPA on the SIPRNET. We verified that SPA maintains personnel location information and we validated that the SPA system includes the data elements required by the DoD Instruction. We also reviewed the electronic response that indicated the records were successfully transferred to DMDC.

## **Navy Did Not Report Daily Location Data**

Personnel from DMDC, Chief of Naval Operations, and Navy Personnel Command stated the Navy did not report required daily location data of deployed Service members to DMDC. In the absence of Navy Service member location data reporting, DMDC extracted information from data that the Navy reported to address other requirements. The Navy used Individual Personnel Tempo (ITEMPO) data to satisfy the requirement in Public Law 106-65, “National Defense Authorization Act for 2000,” October 5, 1999, that mandated the Military Departments to implement a system to track and manage, on an individual basis, the personnel tempo of every member of the Armed Forces. However, the information contained in ITEMPO did not include all the data elements required by the DoD Instruction for daily location reporting, most notably the location elements. See Appendix B for the Navy data elements not reported.

*The Navy did not report required daily location data of deployed Service members to DMDC.*

## **Appropriate Navy Commands Not Tasked**

The Office of the ASN(M&RA) did not task appropriate Navy commands to establish roles and responsibilities for implementing the DoD Instruction that required reporting

the daily location of deployed Service members. SECNAV Instruction 5430.7N, “Assignment of Responsibilities and Authorities in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy,” June 9, 2005, which was in effect when the DoD Instruction was issued, defines the Office of the ASN(M&RA) responsibilities.\* One of the responsibilities was to act as the approving authority, on behalf of the Secretary of Navy when coordinating DoD issuances, specifically the issuances for the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness.

The ASN(M&RA) submitted comments on the formal coordination of the draft DoD Instruction to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs). Regarding the section of the draft DoD Instruction concerning daily location reporting, the Navy concurred with minor comments. According to DoD Instruction 5025.01, “DoD Directives,” October 28, 2007, after formal comments were resolved, Washington Headquarters Service (WHS) distributed the DoD issuances, to include DoD Instructions.

WHS distributes unclassified issuances electronically by posting it to the DoD Issuances Web site. According to personnel at the WHS Directive Division, the DoD Component who has approving authority in the coordination process for a DoD issuance, is responsible for accessing the Web site periodically to check for the release of a DoD issuance. Although a formal notification process for released DoD issuances does not exist, personnel can subscribe to an e-mail notification process.

Personnel from the Office of the ASN(M&RA) could not explain why the DoD Instruction was not tasked to the proper Navy commands. Because the DoD Instruction was not tasked to the appropriate Navy commands for implementation, the Navy did not establish roles and responsibilities for daily location reporting of deployed Service members.

## **Lack of Complete Data Hinders the Ability to Monitor Potential Hazardous Exposures**

Without Navy deployment data, DMDC does not have comprehensive DoD daily location records available for users to monitor, assess, and control or reduce health risks from Service member exposures to occupational and environmental hazards. An example of the usefulness of daily location data is illustrated in DoD OIG Report No. SPO-2010-006, “Exposure to Sodium Dichromate at Qarmat Ali, Iraq in 2003,” September 17, 2010. The audit concluded that because of the absence of complete personnel, duty, and other relevant records for individuals who served near Qarmat Ali in 2003, it was not possible to determine with precision if all exposed individuals were identified, contacted, and offered medical care.

---

\*SECNAV Instruction 5430.7Q “Assignment of Responsibilities and Authorities in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy,” August 17, 2009; superseded SECNAV Instruction 5430.7N; however, the approving authority responsibilities for the ASN(M&RA) did not change.

If personnel experience medical problems related to exposures, DoD must ensure they have access to appropriate medical care for all conditions related to their military service. If a hazardous site is identified, agencies or departments can use the personnel deployment information maintained at DMDC to identify potentially affected personnel for medical evaluation and treatment. In addition, deployment location data for Service members can assist in identifying potential exposure sites. Analyzing the location histories of Service members that exhibit post-deployment symptoms of occupational or environmental exposure can assist in identifying hazardous locations.

## **Recommendation, Management Comments, and Our Response**

**We recommend the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) task the appropriate commands to establish roles and responsibilities for implementing daily location reporting for deployed Service members required by DoD Instruction 6490.03, “Deployment Health,” August 11, 2006.**

### ***Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Comments***

The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) agreed with the recommendation. He stated the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS) was the Navy’s personnel reporting solution, but it was canceled in February 2010 due to compatibility problems between DIMHRS and numerous legacy data systems. Upon reviewing the discussion draft, the Secretary of the Navy issued a memorandum on March 23, 2012, directing the Chief of Naval Operations to develop a plan of action and milestones within 3 months, outlining the way to achieve compliance with the location reporting requirements of DoD Instruction 6490.03, “Deployment Health,” August 11, 2006.

### ***Our Response***

Comments from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) were responsive, and the action met the intent of the recommendation. As of June 29, 2012, the Chief of Naval Operations did not provide a plan of action and may request an extension of the due date. No further comments are required.

## **Appendix A. Scope and Methodology**

We conducted this performance audit from June 2011 through April 2012 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objective.

We focused our review to evaluate the status of the Military Departments' implementation of daily Service member location tracking and weekly reporting to DMDC. We interviewed personnel in the Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to review assistance provided to the Office of the Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) in determining the Services and Combatant Commands compliance with the requirements of the DoD Instruction. We met with personnel from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) to determine their role and concerns with daily location reporting. We met with representatives from the Services Human Resource or Personnel Commands to determine responsible activities and Service-specific procedures. We met with personnel from various Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps activities to evaluate compliance with reporting requirements outlined in the DoD Instruction. We interviewed U.S. Central Command personnel to determine their role in daily location reporting, and we interviewed DMDC personnel to determine the inputs received from each Service, to include systems and data elements. We reviewed and analyzed Service guidance for daily location reporting and we determined Service compliance with data elements listed in Enclosure 5 of DoD Instruction 6490.03, "Deployment Health," August 11, 2006.

### **Use of Computer-Processed Data**

We reviewed computer processed data showing that the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps appropriately reported certain data elements from DTAS, DCAPES, and SPA respectively. We did not evaluate the accuracy of deployment location data, only that the data elements existed. This did not affect the findings or conclusions in the report.

### **Prior Coverage**

During the last 5 years, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General (DoD IG), and the Navy issued three reports discussing the need for or the systems used in reporting of daily location of deployed service members. Unrestricted GAO reports can be accessed over the Internet at <http://www.gao.gov>. Unrestricted DoD IG reports can be accessed at <http://www.dodig.mil/>. Naval Audit Service reports are not available over the Internet.

**GAO**

GAO Report No. GAO-11-63, “Afghanistan and Iraq: DOD Should Improve Adherence to Its Guidance on Open Pit Burning and Solid Waste Management,” October 15, 2010

**DoD IG**

SPO-2010-006, “Exposure to Sodium Dichromate at Qarmat Ali, Iraq in 2003-Part I-Evaluation of Efforts to Identify, Contact and Provide Access to Care for Personnel,” September 17, 2010

**Navy**

N2009-0032, “Marine Corps Use of the Deployed Theater Accountability System,” June 4, 2009

## Appendix B. Service Compliance With Required Reporting Data Elements

Reporting Data Elements Required by DoD Instruction 6490.03	Army	Navy	Air Force	Marine Corps
DoD Electronic Data Interchange Person Identifier <sup>1</sup>				
Member Social Security Number	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Service Branch Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Uniformed Service Organization Component Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Member Surname Text	Yes		Yes	Yes
Member Forename Text	Yes		Yes	Yes
Member Middle Initial Text	Yes		Yes	Yes
Member Birth Calendar Date	Yes		Yes	Yes
Assigned Unit Identification Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Attached Unit Identification Code	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Deployment Start Date	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Deployment End Date	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Operation Plan Identification Code	Yes		Yes	Yes
Location Start Date	Yes		Yes	Yes
Location End Date	Yes		Yes	Yes
Location Longitude Coordinate Code <sup>2</sup>				
Location Longitude Direction Code <sup>2</sup>				
Location Latitude Coordinate Code <sup>2</sup>				
Location Latitude Direction Code <sup>2</sup>				
Grid Coordinate Code <sup>2</sup>	Yes			Yes
Geolocation Code <sup>2</sup>			Yes	
Location Country Code	Yes		Yes	Yes
Location State Code	Yes		Yes	Yes
Location Calendar Date	Yes		Yes	Yes
Operation Name Text	Yes		No <sup>3</sup>	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Not required for Services not using the Common Access Card in their deployment location reporting.

<sup>2</sup> Services are required to report either longitude/latitude codes, grid coordinate code, or geolocation code.

<sup>3</sup> According to AFPC personnel, operation name not reported but available upon request.

# Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) Comments



**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
(MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)  
1000 NAVY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20350-1000

MAY 24 2012

## MEMORANDUM FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**SUBJECT:** Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service members Generally Adequate; However, Navy Needed Improvement

In response to the Department of Defense (DoD) Inspector General's memorandum dated April 30, 2012, Navy has reviewed and concurs with the subject draft report, and provides the following two comments for clarity and context.

First, when Navy concurred in 2006 with the daily reporting requirement of Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 6490.03, *Deployment Health*, the intent was Navy would modify and implement the Marine Corps Total Force System to achieve compliance. However, the Services were subsequently prohibited from developing personnel systems that would duplicate capabilities envisioned for the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System (DIMHRS). As a result, the decision was made that DIMHRS would be Navy's personnel reporting solution. In February 2010, compatibility problems between DIMHRS and numerous legacy data systems led DoD to cancel DIMHRS, and with it, Navy's anticipated personnel reporting system.

Second, before the release of subject draft report, the Secretary of the Navy issued the attached memorandum directing the Chief of Naval Operations to devise a plan to achieve compliance with DoDI 6490.03.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Juan M. Garcia".

Juan M. Garcia

Attachment:  
As stated

Copy to:  
NAVIG



THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY  
WASHINGTON DC 20350-1000

March 23, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

SUBJECT: Recording the Daily Location of Deployed Service Members

Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 6490.03, "Deployment Health," was issued on August 11, 2006. Among other things, it required the Military Departments to plan, program, and implement a system to ensure daily location recording for all deployed personnel assigned, attached, on temporary duty, or temporary additional duty to deployed units. Implementation of this system was required by August 11, 2009.

I have recently received a draft DoD Inspector General Report entitled "Improvements Needed in Reporting the Daily Location of Deployed Service Members," which finds that, while the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps have complied with this requirement, Navy has not.

Accordingly, you are directed to submit to this office a detailed plan of action and milestones within three months, outlining the way ahead to achieve compliance with the location recording and reporting requirements contained in DoD Instruction 6490.03.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ray Mabus".

Ray Mabus



# Inspector General Department *of* Defense